

# **Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/339,959

Applicant(s)

KAKUTANI, TOSHIAKI

Examiner

Kimberly A Williams

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ron Rudder.

(3) Kimberly A. Williams.

(2) Melanie Vida.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,5,9 and 12-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Toshiaki (EP 0820187).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Kimberly A. Williams  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

KA Williams  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding the drawing objections, Mr. Rudder pointed out that the control circuit (40) is shown in fig. 3 and the computer(90) is shown in fig. 1. The examiner pointed out that it is unclear what the dotted box indicates in fig. 10. The examiner indicated that there is still confusion on fig. 11 and clarification is still needed. The drawing objection of fig. 10 regarding element 39 is withdrawn since it is disclosed on page 13 of the specification. Regarding the 112's, the proposed changes discussed during the interview for claims 9,13 and 15 cleared the lack of antecedent basis. Regarding claim 5 the term "turning values" may be amended to clarify this feature in accordance with page 22. Mr. Rudder emphasized that the present invention distinguishes the dot size(sm. med. lg.) as opposed to mixing different color inks taught by Toshiaki. Further the pres. invention precalculates the error diffusion distribution before the dot size is selected wherein Toshiaki determines the on/off dot before error diffusion. The applicant will point out these differences in the remarks for further consideration .